

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-6, and 9-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added because claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2, 3, 7, and 8. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8 and 32-34 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the abstract for using the phrase "such as." In an effort to expedite prosecution, the Abstract is amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 11, 12, 16-19, 23 and 27-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0199731 (Empedocles). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a display device, comprising: at least one substrate provided with a display unit and display-unit-driving wiring lines, at least one of the display unit and the display-unit-driving wiring lines including a conductor layer formed on the substrate from a conductive material in a conductor forming process; and a radio communication device having a communication integrated-circuit unit and an antenna, the communication integrated-circuit unit being mounted on the substrate, at least a part of the antenna being formed on the substrate in the same conductor layer, from the same conductive material, and in the same conductor forming process as the conductor layer of the at least one of the display unit and the display-unit-driving wiring lines, the communication integrated-circuit unit and the antenna being electrically connected to each other by the conductor layer of the at least one of the display unit and the display-unit-driving wiring lines.

Empedocles does not teach, nor would it have suggested, each and every feature of the claimed invention. Specifically, Empedocles does not teach, nor would it have suggested, at

least (1) "a communication integrated-circuit unit being mounted on the substrate, at least part of the antenna being formed on the substrate in the same conductive material, and in the same conductor forming process as the conductor layer of the at least one of the display unit and the display-unit-driving wiring lines, the communication integrated-circuit unit and the antenna being electrically connected to each other by the conductor layer of the at least one of the display unit and the display-unit-driving wiring lines" and (2) "at least one of the display unit and the display-unit-driving wiring lines including a conductor layer formed on the substrate from a conductive material in a conductor forming process."

Empedocles generally discloses a tag 3004 that includes an antenna 3102, a transceiver 3104, a storage 3106, a beam steering array 3108, and a tag controller 3110. See Fig. 31A. These components may be mounted, attached, printed, or otherwise formed on a substrate 3118. See paragraph [0298]. Empedocles does not indicate what material the antenna is formed of, as well as whether the components are formed using the same process. Additionally, there is no indication that the RFID tag is connected to a display unit. Accordingly, as Empedocles does not teach, nor would it have suggested, at least these features of the claimed invention, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Further, claims 4-6, 11, 12, 16-19 and 27-31, which variously depend from claim 1, are neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by Empedocles at least based on their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 11, 12, 16-19 and 27-31 are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 9, 10, 13-15, 20-22 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Empedocles in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,863,219 (Jacobsen). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Empedocles cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested each and every feature of claim 1. Jacobsen does not remedy the deficiencies in the application of Empedocles to the features of claim 1. As such, the combination of Empedocles and Jacobsen cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of features recited in claims 9, 10, 12-15, 20-22, and 24-26 for at least the respective dependence of these claims on an allowable base claim, as well as the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 10, 13-15, 20-22 and 24-26 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 4-6, and 9-31 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Ariana E. Guss  
Registration No. 58,997

JAO:AEG/jnm

Date: February 7, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--